R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

To advance prosecution, claim 13 has been amended to delete the phrase objected to by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Nevertheless, it is respectfully submitted that the recitation of a "wringing fit for self alignment with the rigidly secured spur gear" (which remains in claim 13), in view of the disclosure in the application as a whole, must be understood as meaning a fit that is non-rigid and allows for a certain mutual angular movement between the wring-fitted spur gear 37 and the spindle 38 on which it is fitted.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that "[a] 'wringing fit' is defined as an interference fit, thereby preventing the claimed displacement of the wring-fitted spur gear relative to the common spindle."

The Examiner is correct in noting that a wringing fit may, in some situations, be defined as interference fit. However, an interference fit does not require that the fit be rigid or completely locked. Rather, an interference fit implies that there is a resistance - friction - that needs be overcome in order to achieve mutual movement.

This meaning - that there is friction between the wring-fitted spur gear and the spindle that can be overcome - is evident from both the disclosure in the specification and the recitation in claim 13. At the bottom of page 3, the specification discloses that "the spur gear has a wringing fit on the spindle for obtaining self alignment with the other spur gear." And claim 13 similarly recites that "the other one of the two axially spaced spur gears is supported on the common spindle via a wringing fit for self alignment with the rigidly secured spur gear."

It is apparent from the specification and drawings that spur gears 36 and 37 are arranged with a splined connection with respect to both the surrounding ring gear 22 and the shaft 30. Thus, the spindle 38, due to the rigid connection to the spur gear 36, will be rotated in a conventional manner around its own axis and around the axis of the shaft 30 as the spur gear 36 is affected by the rotation of the shaft 30 and the ring gear 22.

In addition, it is respectfully pointed out that, as understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art, there is no allowance between interconnected parts in a splined connection, as opposed to a wringing fit, due to the interconnected teeth (splines). Hence, it is clear that the rotation of the other spur gear 37 is driven by the splined connection to the shaft 30 and the ring gear 22 and that the same rotation may under the

action of certain torsional deflections be somewhat limited, but not prevented, by the wringing fit to the spindle 38.

Still further, it is respectfully pointed out that according to the disclosure in the specification, "[o]ne of the spur gears 36 is rigidly secured to the spindle 38, whereas the other spur gear 37 has a wringing fit on the spindle." Thus, contrary to the Examiner's suggested interpretation, the specification clearly defines the wringing fit as not being rigid. In this connection, moroever, it is respectfully pointed out that claim 13 also uses different language to refer to the "rigidly secured" spur gear as opposed to the spur gear "supported via a wringing fit."

Thus, the Examiner might be correct that "wringing fit" has a different meaning in other situations or fields. In the context of this application, however, it is clearly apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that "wringing fit" means a fit that is not rigid, and that allows for some rotation "for obtaining self alignment."

As described at the bottom of page 3 of the specification, the wringing fit, in combination with play in the needle bearing 39, will make the two planet wheels share a load evenly regardless of occurring torsional deflection of the planet wheel carrier. From this description, a person of ordinary skill would recognize that such occurring torsional deflections of the planet

wheel carrier 32 will impose an angular deflection between the planet wheels which is only allowed due to the wringing fit of one of the planet wheels (spur gears) 37. A rigid fit would not allow any adaptation to occurring torsional deflection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, including the definition that the "wringing fit" is not rigid, is fully supported by the disclosure in the specification and drawings.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13, with "wringing fit" properly interpreted in the context of this application, clearly patentably distinguishes over the prior art of record. The wringing fit provides advantages over the prior art with respect to the distribution of forces, especially in response to occurring torsional deflections of the planet wheel carrier 32, where the wringing fit makes it possible to share the load between the planet wheels 36, 37 irrespective of the occurring torsional deflections.

The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the structure recited in claim 13 whereby one of the two axially spaced spur gears is rigidly secured to the common spindle, and the other one of the two axially spaced spur gears is supported on the common spindle via a wringing fit for self alignment with the rigidly secured spur gear, thereby evenly sharing a load between the two axially spaced spur gears.

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims, and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Holtz, Holtz, Goodman & Chick PC
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH/IV:dd/pm
encs.